Under this structure, the officers of a district council with, say, 10,000 members could be subject to election by a council consisting of perhaps 100 delegates from locals, which means that anyone who could control the votes of at least 51 delegates could dominate the affairs of 10,000 members. The reality of union politics (and perhaps most politics) is that an international union has ample powers and resources to control, win over, some might even say to buy off, a handful of delegates by a myriad of means: union staff jobs, favored treatment, junkets, moral and practical support in their locals, etc.

Direct election by local members allows the rank and file to control their officers. Election by council delegates, allows the international to control the delegates and the officers; the LMRDA is eviscerated.

One proposed amendment would simply restore the rights originally intended by the LMRDA. In essence it means that the officers of those intermediate bodies which have taken over the rights and functions of locals in collective bargaining will be elected by direct membership vote, just as in the locals, thereby restoring the right of members directly to control their own officers. However, where intermediate bodies still exist essentially as administrative units outside the collective bargaining process, they will continue to have the right to elect offices by delegate vote.

Union spokesmen and others argue that it is necessary to centralize power in the hands of district organizations in order to strengthen the unions in their dealing with employer conglomerates and to make them more efficient in organizing the unorganized. I would not quarrel with that contention. However, the aim of ''modernizing'' unions does not justify the proposed restrictions on membership rights, especially the right to elect officers by direct membership vote. Quite the contrary. The more centralization becomes necessary, the more necessary it becomes to strengthen democratic rights as a counterweight to the bureaucratic tendencies inevitable in all centralization. The adoption of a new U.S. Constitution was necessary to strengthen the United States by giving powers to a central national authority. But precisely because that move was essential to national welfare, it was necessary, at the same time, to bolster democratic rights by adding the Bill of Rights to the new Constitution. Some of our union officers want the authority and the centralization but without the saving salt of democracy.

Recourse against improper trusteeships

One of the glaring abuses revealed at hearings of the McClellan Committee in the late fifties was the practice by various international unions of arbitrarily lifting the autonomous rights of locals and other subordinate bodies and subjecting them to control by appointed trustees. In many instances, international officials used the trusteeship device to loot local treasuries, to eliminate independent-minded critics, even to prevent the replacement of corrupt officials by reformers, and to manipulate the votes of locals in referendums and at conventions.

Title III of the LMRDA aimed to provide recourse against these abuses. At the time, this section of the law was considered so important that it was one of the few major provisions that allowed for alternate means of enforcement: either by private suit or by a complaint to the Labor Department.

As written, the provision has had some positive effect. At the time the LMRDA was adopted in 1959, the Labor Department reported, 487 trusteeships were current. In June 1998, thirty-nine years later, 311 trusteeships were reported. [see Union Democracy Review, No. 120]. The law has made it much more impossible. The law does restrict the ability to manipulate the local's votes. But it has not succeeded in preventing an international union from misusing the trusteeship device to undermine and repress members rights, to discredit and destroy critics of the top officials. The trouble is that, as time passed, those who use trusteeships for devious aims have learned how to thwart and evade the purposes of Title III, which is why it needs strengthening.

Title III permits trusteeships to be imposed for certain legitimate reasons; and, if unions actually obeyed the law, there would be little problem. However, to evade the requirements of Title III, a union officialdom need only learn how to fill out the required reporting form. If the real purpose of a trusteeship is illegitimate, the international can easily conceal that fact simply by listing a legitimate, but vaguely formulated, purpose permitted by the law. Over the years, union officials have discovered that they can do this with impunity because the enforcement provisions of Title III are ineffective.

The Labor Department has no incentive for checking the validity of the Title III reporting forms because the law authorizes it to investigate the validity of a trusteeship only upon the complaint of a union member. Moreover, the law presumes a trusteeship valid for 18 months. In no single case known to me has the Labor Department ever challenged a trusteeship in court before the lapse of 18 months, even after union members have submitted persuasive complaints to it. The same problem faces complainants in Federal court, where judges routinely dismiss complaints against trusteeships on procedural grounds before the 18-month period has expired.

It is not difficult for a complaining union member to succeed in lifting a trusteeship once the 18 months is up and the presumption of validity has been removed. At that point, judges and the Labor Department offer recourse, but by that time it is too often too late to revive any momentum for democracy that has been lost.

It is true that sometimes trusteeships are imposed for legitimate reasons: to root out corruption or to restore orderly democratic procedure; and nothing in the proposed LMRDA amendments will eliminate that power. Unfortunately, there are other cases, too many, where trusteeships are imposed, on one pretext or another, to suppress challenge from below to the officialdom above. In such instances, trustees utilize that 18-month period, during which their power is virtually immune from challenge, to undermine their rivals or critics. Elected local officers are usually suspended or removed. Local meetings are often abandoned, sometimes collective bargaining contracts are imposed upon the membership without their consent, local bylaws are revised arbitrarily. Meanwhile, by fear or favor, the power of the trustee is employed to construct a local political machine loyal to the top officialdom. This kind of maneuver is quite possible, because the trustee controls the local's finances, grievance procedures, and—sometimes—hiring hall referrals. He normally has the power to hire and fire paid staff.

After living under these conditions for 18 months, any independent opposition is easily demoralized and tends to disintegrate. At that point, the trustee can call for new elections, supervised by a committee chosen by him or his cronies, fairly confident that no effective challenge is likely to survive.

The proposed amendment will not prevent any fair-minded union leadership, where necessary, from trusteeing a local under conditions specified under Title III. Wide latitude is permitted by the statute which authorizes trusteeships, among other specific conditions, for ''otherwise carrying out the legitimate objects of such labor organization.''

What the proposed amendment would do is quite simple.

1. It would fill an urgent need by providing, for the first time, the possibility of effective recourse against arbitrary trusteeships. By removing the 18-month presumption of validity, it would encourage the courts and the Labor Department to seriously consider complaints from unionists, look beyond what the union lists on reporting forms, and consider whether the actual operations of any trusteeship are lawful.

2. It provides for a specific additional assurance of fair treatment in the immediate aftermath of an improper trusteeship. If a union resists the lifting of the trusteeship and a complaining unionist or the Labor Department is forced to file suit in Federal court and the court orders the dissolution of the trusteeship, it would be anomalous to permit the trustee to dominate the process of choosing the self-governing local leadership for the post-trusteeship period. The amendment would require either the reinstatement of the local officers previously elected by the membership or a new election under supervision of the court, assuring them of the right to a leadership of their own choosing in a fair election.

In summary, the proposed amendments are modest and clear, they impose no burdens upon the labor movement, and they would substantially strengthen the rights of members in their unions.

TRIBUTE TO LEROY PARMENTER

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1998

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, recently I was reminded that some of the best things in life are those things that too often go unnoticed. Leroy Parmenter was that way. A resident of Sikeston, Missouri, he was a man whose spirit of generosity and love for life was a bright sunshine in what these days too often seems like a gray and cloudy world. I wanted to share with all of you a few words from an article in the Sikeston Standard Democrat that recounted this remarkable individual's life.

''Leroy was one of those few who accomplished good deeds quietly. I had known Mr. Parmenter since Little League and graduated from high school with his son. But as a youngster I knew nothing about the selfless devotion and true concern for others that Leroy Parmenter showed every day of his life.''

''It is sometimes awkward to know a man when you're a youngster and then to work along side him when you're grown. But it wasn't that way with Leroy. I had the pleasure to work on community projects with Leroy and was always amazed with his enthusiasm and his love of people. And believe me, it was genuine love. There was not a phony bone in his body. He visited veterans' homes and nursing homes because he wanted to let people know that someone cared about them.''

This past summer Leroy Parmenter passed away. While he isn't walking and talking with us on a daily basis, I know that his spirit remains with each of us who were touched by his kindness. His good works and thoughtful deeds have not gone unnoticed. And I hope that on those cloudy days, we'll remember others like Leroy Parmenter. You know, those

unique and caring men and women who as the Sikeston Standard Democrat noted, ''accomplish good deeds quietly. (Who) never sought/(seek) the spotlight—though are/(were) proud when projects are/(were) successful.''

Mr. Speaker, the author of this article had it right, ''Leroy's reward was a smile on a kid's face. And he brought ample smiles through the years.'' Thank you Leroy—for the lives you touched—then and today.

IN HONOR OF EDDIE BLAZONCZYK

HON. ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH

OF ILLINOIS

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1998

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. KUCINICH, and I rise today to honor Mr. Eddie Blazonczyk for his contributions to the American polka tradition. He was recently recognized for his achievements by the National Endowment for Arts during a White House ceremony where he was presented with the prestigious 1998 National Heritage Fellowship Award. Mr. Blazonczyk is a bandleader who has set the standard for Chicago-style polka, a sound that defines ''polka'' music for millions of Americans.

Born in 1941, Mr. Blazonczyk was raised surrounded by the sounds of polka. His mother directed a Gorale, a southern Polish music and dance ensemble, and his father played the cello for that group. His parents also owned a banquet hall where he was exposed to some of the great polka musicians of that time. Influenced by his childhood experiences with the Polish heritage, he decided to form his own polka band, the Versatones. He worked to forge a new polka sound that incorporated more raucous, ''honky'' sounds.

Throughout his career, Mr. Blazonczyk has developed quite a following, not only among the tens of thousands of polka dancers in Polish-American communities, but also among younger musicians in Polish polka bands. His interpretation of old folk music and his ideal singing voice for Polish songs have made him a star in the polka music community. He has appeared more than 4,800 times since he began his band in 1963, and he still keeps a schedule with over 175 performances a year. His tireless zeal for his art was recognized when he received a Grammy for the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences in 1986.

My fellow colleagues, please join us in congratulating Mr. Eddie Blazonczyk for receiving the 1998 National Heritage Fellowship Award in recognition of his revolutionary and outstanding contributions to polka music. His singing and more than 50 recordings will be enjoyed by polka lovers for years to come.

SALUTE TO JACK CORRIGAN: MR. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

HON. SHERWOOD H. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 13, 1998

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 13, 1998 it was my privilege to share in a special retirement ceremony for one of the finest, most decent, most caring, sharing individuals I have ever known.

On that day, in Philadelphia, local, state, and national leaders joined in honoring Jack Corrigan upon the occasion of his retirement after Nearly 30 years of distinguished service in the U.S. Department of Commerce's Economic Development Administration.

There is so much to be said about Mr. Corrigan's superb public service. It can best be summed up by noting that in 1995 he received the Lifetime Achievement Award for excellence in the field of economic development from the National Council on Urban Economic Development for his innovative economic development, thought, and leadership.

One of the old pros in the economic development field is a long-time good friend, Dave Rally, currently Legislative Advisor to the Public Works and Economic Development Association.

When I mentioned to Mr. Rally that I would be participating in the salute to Jack Corrigan, he immediately recalled what he termed ''one of the best speeches ever'' on the subject of economic development. Guess who gave it? Jack Corrigan. Mr. Rally was so impressed by the speech that he kept it at the ready and quickly retrieved it more than three years after it was given.

I, too, was greatly impressed, so much so that I append it here to my remarks with the thought that a reading of this ''insider's look'' at the role of the Federal Government—an historical perspective—will be enlightening, instructive and inspiring for all.

Jack Corrigan brings credit to the title public servant. His dedication and good work enriched the lives of literally hundreds of thousands of Americans and helped transform areas of distress into zones of opportunity. What a magnificent legacy!

EDA AND THE FEDERAL ROLE IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT—AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

(Address by John E. Corrigan, Director, Philadelphia Regional Office, Economic Development Administration, EDA Regional Meeting, Philadelphia, PA, February, 1995)

This year marks the thirtieth anniversary of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (PWEDA). Yet what should be a year to celebrate the effectiveness and contribution of the Economic Development Administration (EDA) may become a year when EDA faces the most serious threat to its very existence. In the weeks and months ahead there will be a national debate that will challenge the validity of concepts that are the reasons why EDA was created and sustained for the past 30 years.

We, the true believers, must not simply dismiss those who see no reason for our existence as simply mean spirited heretics but rather in the coming months we must engage them in a discussion of ideas. As Peter Drucker observed: ''Every person and institution operates on the basis of a theory whether they realize it or not.'' EDA is a response to a specific theory about development. Those who seek our elimination have a very different theory of development.

There is little disagreement in the United States that the existence within our country of hundreds of areas of very low income and of persistently high unemployment is a national concern. The question which is in dispute is whether the Federal government ought to make efforts to alter the productive structure of such areas so that they may maintain their level of population, balance their trade with competing regions, and achieve a rate of growth in their per capita incomes which approximates the national rate by making those areas more competitive. There are two quite distinct theories on this. Proponents of the National Demand approach, also known as the Market approach, assert that over the long term the competitive forces of the market do create an optimal spatial distribution of economic activity. The private sector will locate where costs are least and profits greatest. Therefore if any area does show persistent symptoms of severe distress this should be interpreted as a clear warning that the nation has a declining need for this particular part of national space. We can let it deteriorate. The alternative thesis, which can be called the theory of Planned Adjustment, assumes that local economic problems persist precisely because competitive forces do not create an optimal spatial distribution of economic activity. Thus the lagging regions suffer not only because of the internal misuse of their resources but also because external investors, who are unaware of the favorable opportunities for investments in such areas, continue to pour funds into the overexpanded metropolitan areas within growing regions. These areas are lagging, in part, because they are not able to invest in infrastructure, both human and physical, which would make the area economically profitable to the private sector. Such deficiencies in the market system, it is argued, can be overcome by planning for the adaption of the supply characteristics of the lagging regions (investing in infrastructure, including capacity as well as bricks and mortar) so that they become self-sustaining, retain their population, and attract investment from the oversized metropolitan areas.

Because he believed in the first theory of development, the National Demand model, the Market model, President Nixon in 1972 called for the termination of EDA and stated boldly: ''There is no need for a national development policy''. And in 1980, President Jimmy Carter's White House Conference on Balanced National Growth and Economic Development, much to our surprise, recommended that the solution to the problem of distressed areas was for the federal government to provide assistance so that citizens could move to more prosperous areas reflecting clearly a belief in this first theory of development—vote with your feet. And President Reagan after recommending the elimination of EDA in this State of the Union message in January 1981, explained his position further by stating: ''The administration intends to deal with economic development at the subnational level by improving the national economy.''

In response we need to loudly proclaim that this theory of economic development espoused by President Nixon, by President Carter's Balanced National Growth Conference and by President Reagan is wrong, that it has no historic basis in fact and that it has not been our national economic policy for the past 150 years.

In a Senate Speech in 1981, defending EDA, Senator George Mitchell outlined that history.

In 1850, when it became apparent that the success of the Eastern States in building their rail networks promised an increase in wealth for the entire eastern seaboard, Congress enacted the Railroad Land Grant Act—truly landmark legislation—to encourage, by Federal subsidy, the expansion of the rail network in the South and West. And for 21 years thereafter, Congress continued to grant rail land rights. One Hundred Thirty One million acres to land were granted for that purpose—a Federal subsidy for Western